

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2741

OLUDARE OGUNDE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ALEXANDRIA JOURNAL; KARLA HULT, a journal
writer and reporter at Alexandria Journal;
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

UNKNOWN EDITOR OF ALEXANDRIA JOURNAL; UNKNOWN
PUBLISHER OF ALEXANDRIA JOURNAL,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief District
Judge. (CA-98-533-A)

Submitted: September 30, 1999

Decided: October 5, 1999

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Oludare Ogunde, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Charles Junker, Alexander Young Thomas, HAZEL & THOMAS, P.C., Alexandria, Virginia; Richard Parker, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Oludare Ogunde appeals the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of Karla Hult and The Alexandria Journal and dismissing the United States in this state law defamation action. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Ogunde v. Alexandria Journal, No. CA-98-533-A (E.D. Va. June 22, 1998 & Nov. 13, 1998).^{*} We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Although the district court's orders are marked as "filed" on June 19, 1998, and November 10, 1998, the district court's records show that the orders were entered on the docket sheet on June 22, 1998, and November 13, 1998. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision.